DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 733 HE 000 814

By-Bonnen, James T.

Overcoming the Constraints of the Present University System.

Michigan State Univ., East Lansing.
Pub Date 15 Oct 68
Note-29p.; Paper prepared for the Symposium on the University and the Transformation of Social and Political Institutions, Chicago, Ill., Chicago 15, 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.55
Descriptors-Action Programs (Community), Administrative Organization, *Faculty, *Higher Education, *Organization, Responsibility, *Social Change, *Social Responsibility

Various characteristics of the American university operate to constrain its participation in changing economic and social institutions. It is understood that the university has multiple roles, has a long legitimized public service role which is becoming a university-wide commitment, must respond responsibly to the pressures for wider involvement in problem solving, is acquiring responsibility for lifelong education, is an instrument of national purpose and is a major component of the power structure. We are a society of large scale organizations. The implications of a social order dominated by large scale organizations and the ideal nature of a university's problem-solving mission have a considerable impact on the strategy that is adopted. The organization of the university has prevented a coordinated assault on urban problems; and although campuses resent having new organizational forms imposed on them from the outside, a national interdependent system of higher education is developing which will, perhaps, be more effective in accomplishing social change. The university today is beset with conflicting pressures from both within and without. If it is to attempt to alter social institutions, the faculty must become more conscious and respectful of the diversity of norms underlying behavior within the university; the reward system must be changed; the nature and processes of the university should be communicated to faculty and students; and some university outreach activities should be instituted. (JS)

ED028733

Overcoming the Constraints of the Present University System

by

James T. Bonnen

Michigan State University

Prepared for the Symposium

on the

University and the Transformation of Social and Political Institutions

Chicago, October 15, 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 814

Overcoming the Constraints of the Present University System*

by

James T. Bonnen**

Michigan State University

I have been asked to discuss how we might overcome the characteristics of the American university that presently constrain effective university participation in transforming economic and social institutions. While I believe I perceive some of the problems, I am far from sure what the university should do in overcoming these difficulties. In any case, I address myself both to the problems and to possible ways of overcoming them.

This assignment presumes that the university has a role in transforming economic and social institutions. An entire jungle of issues surrounds such an assumption, but I shall not treat them here.[1/]

Let me clear some additional ground by making explicit a few matters that I shall assume as a description of historical and present reality. While some academics do not accept parts of this description as true, these matters have been reasonably well-established. I take as a fact that:

1. The university is an institution of multiple roles which have arisen in response to the needs of society.

---

*Prepared for the Symposium on "The University and the Transformation of Social and Political Institutions", Chicago, October 15, 1968.

**I am indebted to L. L. Boger, J. D. Shaffer, L. W. Witt, and L. V. Mandersch for a critical review of an early draft of this paper.

[1/] For a presentation of some of these issues see [4].

2. The public service role of the university is a long legitimized one which is now becoming a university-wide commitment.

3. The university must respond in some responsible manner to the rising pressures for involvement in society's problem solving.

4. The university is now acquiring a responsibility for "lifelong education".

5. As new knowledge has become strategic to economic growth, the university has become an instrument of national purpose.

6. The university has become a major component of the power structure of society.

7. We are today a society of large-scale organizations.

Let me develop each of these assumptions briefly.

1. The university is an institution of multiple roles which have risen in response to the needs of society. Thus, the teaching of theology and the vocational training of priests, the liberal education of a lay elite, the development of the professional schools in law, medicine, engineering, agriculture, business, education, etc., vocational training and mass education for a democratic industrial society, much of the research mission of the modern university; all have arisen out of the needs of the society. Except as a reflection of society's priorities, no one mission is any more intrinsically respectable or legitimate than any other, even if one is several centuries older than another, has more or less direct utility in society, or is held in greater or less esteem by various academic groups.

2. The public service function of the university is a legitimate, historically

sanctioned role. Now, in the post World War II environment, this role is rapidly becoming a university-wide commitment. In the 19th and in the early 20th century, the public affairs commitment was limited to individual units of the university, primarily the professional schools such as business, medicine, and agriculture, with the rest of the university going its own way without such involvement. Today there is a growing belief that responsiveness to the complex problems of an urban environment calls for an across-the-board commitment from the university. An isolated department or college can have limited impact on the problems confronted since such units do not command the required range of expertise [6].

3. The university has no choice but to respond to the pressures for greater involvement in society's attempts to solve its problems. Thus, the university while continuing in its older role as a critic of society is also being asked to be a servant to society. "What troubles American higher education today is the simple fact that it has no choice between these simple alternatives. It must meet both demands. It must serve power and yet make that power humane" [15]. This is a nearly intolerable dilemma.

4. The university is now also acquiring a responsibility for "lifelong education" [2,14]. The university and industry generated acceleration in the rate at which knowledge is created causes a great increase in the rate at which older knowledge grows obsolete. Not only institutions but individuals must now be renewed, to use John Gardner's phrase, possibly several times in a lifetime. This new responsibility comes upon the university while it still is struggling to master its obligations for mass education and to institutionalize and understand its role in public affairs.

5. The university has become an instrument of national purpose as a result of its strategic role in an increasingly knowledge-centered world [9]. As

science has been applied to the affairs of man, society's dependence upon tradition in decision making has given way to a systematic application of knowledge. The continuing evolution of modern society progressively stimulates even greater demands for information and knowledge for public and private problem solving and economic growth. The university has become "one of the chief innovative forces in the society. Insofar as economic development is increasingly dependent on research and new knowledge, the role of the university has been enlarged, and it is becoming one of the determinants rather than a passive reflector of social change" [2]. Increasingly, the largest and most strategic economic investment is that made in the human resources and organization that are devoted to problem solving and innovation in the production process. "Today, the economically significant industrial property is not the machine, but the design, and not so much the design as the capacity to innovate design in process and product" [13]. It is the organization of human knowledge and the human capacity to create new knowledge that have become the strategic factors in the processes of production and thus in economic development, local, regional, and national. As a consequence, neither industry nor the state can now survive without the university and its output. Their demands make the university less free than it has ever been in modern times to go its own way.

6. The university has become a major component of the society's power structure. It is now one of the primary political institutions of society. It consequently is a seat of influence and power. Its faculties move in and out of industries, foundations, and government as consultants, policy advisors and even decision makers. Public and private, local and regional interests compete both in the market and in the political arena for access to the university's research capacity, now so necessary to the economic growth of organizations and communities. The university is a major recipient of public monies obtained

in the political process and in competition with other major claimants. The institutional interdependence of government and higher education is irrevocable, as Daniel Bell points out. "The political system and the university system have become inextricably meshed." And, as a result, "the university has become more vulnerable. . ." [2].

7. We are today a society of large-scale organizations [16]. This is a fact of overpowering significance for any attempt to understand and change social or economic institutions. Wherever one looks, Federal and state government, even much of city government; the complex of large corporations, in extractive industry and manufacturing, in transportation and communication, in retailing; the national structure of highly-centralized unions; the trade and professional associations, even the churches and certainly the universities--all are characterized by large bureaucratic organizations. The social order in which we exist has been transformed. We shall explore this a little further in a moment.

These seven matters I accept as factual, my assumptions if you wish. I do not ascribe any goodness or badness to them. They are just realities that I assume must be dealt with in some manner by the university system in any role it may have in social and economic institution change.

Before discussing the constraints of the present university system, I wish to develop some greater perspective. I want to look at some of the implications of a social order dominated by large-scale organization. Secondly, I wish to make a few observations on the nature of a university mission in transforming social and economic institutions. Both have considerable impact on how such a mission might be successfully mounted.

Some Implications of a Social Order Donimated by Large-Scale Organizations [2]

I shall limit my comments on large-scale organizations to two matters: (1) the effect of large scale organization on human communities, and (2) the exercise of power and decision making in a society in which the social structure is dominated by large-scale organizations.

We are having increasing difficulties in our society in dealing with the needs and problems of human beings as individuals and in communities. Our public and private decision making has been restructured into highly-specialized systems dominated by equally specialized large-scale organizations. These work reasonably well for specialized problem solving, but disastrously fragment the decision making upon which depend the viability and development of human community. We now have specialized national systems of large organizations concerned independently with, for example, housing, highways, welfare, education, public health, etc.

The problem is illustrated by the processes involved in creating more effective highway systems. The specialized national and state highway organizations give little or no consideration to the external effects of their decisions: to the destruction without replacement of low income housing, to the massive congestion of some local areas and the depopulation or isolation of others, and certainly not to the possibility that in some cases mass transit or other forms of transport might be a more desirable alternative. They are concerned with efficient highway building and external effects are someone else's problem--i.e., the community's. Few of our specialized national systems of decision making, public or private, are capable of integrating their various functions at the community level. As a consequence, a breakdown has occurred

---

[2] This section is developed from ideas originally presented by the author in [3].

in our capacity for community problem solving, and society faces a rising incidence of severe social pathologies, particularly in the fabric of urban life. This generates increasing pressure for the university involvement in society's problems.

Large-scale organizations are of necessity bureaucratic structures often manned by specialized professionals. As a result, both of specialization and bureaucracy, large scale organizations are rarely capable of dealing with people as whole humans, or indeed, even as humans. People are increasingly dealt with as things, objects to be manipulated to some specialized usually technological end. A dehumanization of man and of society results. This is evident in the behavior of practically all large-scale organizations, from universities to corporations to the state welfare agencies. One cannot repeal massive social structure changes of this order. We must learn to humanize, to turn to humane use the social order of large-scale organizations--for it is here to stay.

The forces which have produced this transformation of our social organization have greatly increased the minimum necessary scale of efficient and effective organization. Both communities and organizations, as well as those who would change either, must face this fact squarely.

The change in our social organization is such that the idea of community can no longer be constructed around the notion of physical area. Rather it must be conceived as that collectivity of municipal, county, state, and other public and private jurisdictions and organizations (1) which encompass the minimum bundle of resources and population necessary for viability, and (2) which provide legitimate access to various specialized national, state, and other large-scale organizations necessary to provide the full minimum functions of society required for sustained growth.

Access to the power of decision is of the essence in social problem solving.

The power to decide many of the most important aspects of a community's future has moved from the local community to higher aggregates of society and to large-scale organizations--from the local community to state and federal program organizations and to associated committees of the legislature, to the executive suite of a large corporation that controls the major growth factor decisions of subsidiaries in local communities, to national unions, and professional organizations and the universities. The exercise of organized power is today primarily a phenomenon of large-scale organization behavior and is concentrated to a great extent at the national level. Any functional segment of society or any organization that wishes to exercise effective power in its own or another's behalf today must be organized to have access through the national level of social organization. Any local community that wishes to exercise reasonably effective power of decision over its own future must be of sufficient scale and organizational capacity to gain legitimate access at the state, regional, or national level of these many highly-specialized and functionally organized decision systems of society. The university must recognize these organizational imperatives in its outreach to transform social and economic institutions.

Observations on the Nature of the University Mission in Transforming Social and Economic Institutions

Let me turn now to some very brief observations on the nature of any university mission in transforming social and economic institutions.

1. This university role necessarily involves a major commitment to problem-solving research and education. The university or someone else must maintain various types of outreach organization to link university output of research and education effectively to the direct action taking of the problem-solving process.

2. The focus of any university outreach organization must be clearly seen as problem solving. University outreach may not be allowed the luxury of subordinating problem solving to professional or disciplinary goals.
3. The problem-solving focus of university outreach must be pragmatic in approach and outlook, if it is to be successful. Execution of a university mission to transform social and economic institutions will not only involve the creation and extension of relevant knowledge but also action as a catalytic agent in linking (or creating organizations to link) previously not interconnected parts in building problem-solving (or decision) systems. The university's ability to provide neutral ground where contending forces may interact safely is quite critical.
4. This university mission, while primarily educational, is not limited to formal classroom activities, but is devoted to informal education often in the byways of community organization and power.
5. Thus, we academics must face ultimately the clear fact that university outreach is essentially political in its organizational behavior--but with one immense difference. The organized institutional outreach of the university must work for public invisibility in its political activities, and it must maintain the integrity of its educational posture and base. It may not become a politically partisan force. This does not mean that the university may not advocate the primary interests and values of higher education in the political process. The university like any institution is also morally responsible to behave as a good citizen in the daily

operation of its corporate business. However, only the faculty are free to profess any belief or position in the political process. The university as an organization may not. Thus, university outreach organizations often may not take credit for their most important achievements since they were obtained in the informal pathways of organizational and political power, in many cases by convincing parties to the process that the ideas injected into the dialogue were really the activist's own brilliant notion and not the university's. Thus, the activist and his organization receive the credit for success. This also protects the university when an effort fails, and the activist or his organization takes the loser's lumps rather than the university.

6. The strategies of university outreach and the organizational structures of that outreach must be designed to prevent capture by clientele groups and by political associates. In general, this involves avoiding the creation of specialized independent organizations for individual programs or single objectives. It also involves carefully maintaining public expectations of a pluralism in university organizational and program commitments to society.

7. It is not an intelligent tactic today for the university to hide behind the argument that technological change is neutral in social and economic impact. We have almost invariably hidden behind this argument for protection while pursuing the university's role in creating technological change. However, in a social and economic change role one will be involved in action directly affecting social and economic institutions; in such action it should

be patiently obvious to all that there will be some losers as well as gainers. The university will have to devise quite different tactics to protect itself while executing this role.

The universities, in any case, have been irresponsible in hiding behind technology. One might perhaps on occasion use the shield of the neutrality of technological change as a protective political strategy, but one is simultaneously responsible to take into consideration the socioeconomic consequences that almost always occur in implementing a new technology. In failing to do this, the universities have become a major source of the external effects discussed earlier which are now destroying man's environment and social systems. No doubt some university people can be said to have been invincibly ignorant on these matters. Most who were not have found it convenient to believe their own propaganda about technological change being neutral in socioeconomic impact. Thus, the universities have compounded the problem of a growing disparity between our command over technology and our ability to control its effects on man, his environment, and his society.

8. This leads one to another point. It will take very sophisticated strategists and tacticians of societal change to accomplish the social engineering tasks of any university role in transforming social and economic institutions. Far more sophistication and consciousness will be required than in the old role of creating technological change. The university cannot afford outreach structures manned primarily by gut practitioners of the art of social engineering or by well intented but emotional faculty

activists. The university cannot depend on the hit and miss process of on the job experience to provide their only training. University outreach for socioeconomic change must be manned by clear-eyed conscious social engineers.

I do not wish to imply that all university outreach structures or each activity of such an organization will inevitably reflect all of these characteristics before it can attain success. This is an ideal type, if you will. The specific demands of the environment and the problems addressed will also vary with differing consequences to appropriate strategies and designs of outreach structures.

Now, let me turn to some of the constraints of the present university system that must be faced in creating any university mission in social and economic institution change.

Problems in Organization of the University System

In every purposive activity function, organizational form and behavior are inextricably bound together. They must constitute a meaningful system or ineffectiveness and disfunction set in.

The organizational form of the university was created in the middle ages. There has been little fundamental change in that form, even though the university has added many new roles to its mission. Despite this continuity of form, it is interesting to note that different parts of the academic community today have fundamentally different conceptions of that form. To the faculty the university is simply a community of scholars--a collegium. The administrator and the trustees, however, see the university primarily in terms of its legal form as a corporation. As loco parentis dissolves, the students' view of the university increasingly is that of a citizen with a property right purchased by tuition and

fees in a contract in which he has the normal rights of specification of what is delivered in satisfying that contract. As costs to the student have become more and more substantial, both students and their parents increasingly view the university in this light. These three groups often find it difficult today to resolve their conflict of interest. They have very different notions about the nature of the university and consequently about their rights in the institution. Groups external to the university hold even different views.

Up until World War I most universities had uncomplicated and lean administrative hierarchies. Most administrators, including the president, also carried academic responsibilities such as teaching. However, highly-specialized administrative structures have now developed around the president's office as well as the dean and increasingly even at the department level. A substantial number of people are now involved full time in administration in any large university. This is not primarily the result of a grand plot by administrative buccaneers as some faculty seem to believe. It is the consequence of several forces: the now massive and still growing size of student body, service bureaucracy[3/], and faculty; the proliferation of university roles; and the criticism by trustees and legislators of lax and poor quality administration in the husbandry of resources. The result is far greater need for a specialized well-developed administrative function in the university.

The university has become a large-scale organization along with many other of the major institutions of the society. The inevitable consequence is that the university is now a bureaucracy. Not only are its administrative and internal

---

3/ The term service bureaucracy is used to designate the organizations and employees of the university who provide housekeeping and logistical support for the institution. This group now outnumbers the faculty by a wide margin in most institutions.

service functions so executed, but the faculty in organization and behavior is now a bureaucracy. The university has not yet solved its problem of bureaucracy. Not only has its faculty, particularly, not come to terms with the necessity for a major administrative function, but it has yet to learn to accept in its organizational affairs a matching of authority with responsibility. This is imperative in contending with the organizational fragmentation that follows from specialization in any bureaucracy.

Compounding the problem of bureaucracy is the changing role of the university professor and the drift of his allegiance from his institution to his discipline and profession. The alienation of the loyalties of university professors has been well described by others [9, 12]. "Twentieth century professional associations are fundamentally guilds in form as well as function" [7]. A new rise of the guilds is eroding the integrity of the university. Our most prestigious professional groups are evolving into a position similar to that of the guilds of the middle ages--self-regulating bodies which stabilized and eventually helped stultify medieval society in a smug, lifeless elitism and social homeostasis [10]. These rigidities and internal barriers tend to prevent adequate organizational response. Who in the university can discuss in a responsible fashion with the community the interaction of highways, low-income housing, jobs, education, and race relations that intersect in the problem-solving focus on any one of these dimensions of the urban problem?

In evolving our organizational forms in the university, we not only created specialized and highly differentiated subunits, we professionalized them as well. This undoubtedly was necessary, but it has accentuated the relative isolation of man and knowledge and organization one from another within the university. It has diluted, if not subverted, the loyalty of faculty to the university, their college and department, and it has made progressively more difficult,

if not often impossible, the periodic need to mobilize adequate research resources into a problem-solving focus. The intense demands for high-quality academics generated by the great growth of higher education accentuates the effects of professionalization of discipline by providing the individual faculty member with far greater mobility, new roles, and more independence than he has ever previously experienced.

I described earlier the great change that has occurred in the minimum scale of effective institutional relationships in our society today. This has immense consequences for the university. The university was never self-sufficient as a community, but it could previously afford the luxury of believing so. This is no longer the case, for the university is not an adequate unit in either scale or function. It used to be that a university was a replication with only minor variations of every other university. Each attempted to command the full range of all knowledge. The explosive growth of knowledge under the impact of science and society's devotion of far larger amounts of resources to the creation of new knowledge, now makes it impossible for any university to be expert on everything. At the same time the minimum resource needs for true excellence in any one discipline has become so immense, particularly in the case of hard science, that it is a clear impossibility for <u>every</u> university to own facilities of such scale. Perkins describes this vividly in portraying the escalation in hardware costs and the resulting institutional competition in high energy physics research [12].

This is not just a problem of the physical and biological sciences. In the humanities large-scale computer requirements must be faced in linguistic and other research. In the social sciences, increasingly the nature of the problems addressed are of such immense scope that no one university commands sufficient

knowledge to address itself systematically to the whole of the problem. Society is now asking the university to solve or help solve the urban problem. Few, if any, universities have a range of resources and expertise adequate for a coordinated assault on the problem. In addition, many university faculty depreciate and refuse to work on "practical" or problem-solving research, restricting further the resources available for such purposes within the university. As a consequence, public resources devoted to research on society's problems increasingly are going into governmental and private institutes for applied research.[4/]

If the university is unable or refuses to work on the problems of society, society has little choice but to put its problem solving and applied research and educational resources into other institutional arrangements, such as public and private research institutes and the action agencies of government. If this approach should become the general institutional pattern for the research input of societal problem solving it would not be long before most of society's investment in applied, and perhaps even basic, research was channeled through these other institutions leaving the university a weak competitor for research scholars and possibly stripping the university of its role as society's primary knowledge center. This clearly will be the outcome unless the universities can create cooperatively among themselves new institutional arrangements of sufficient scale and organizational capacity to handle at least some of these urgent problems. There are some efforts underway to create new regional forms of intra-university organization. The effort is late and the commitment often

---

4/ A good example of this is the federally financed Urban Institute recently established under the direction of William Gorham in Washington, D. C. It is designed on the model of the Rand Corporation to work on the problems we face in urban life.

inadequate to meet this challenge to the university as the primary institutional form through which knowledge is created.

Out of the more than 2,000 varied institutions of higher learning in this nation, there is evolving a system of higher education. Much like the individual community, the individual university is losing its power of independent decision. Independence is being eroded by specialization and greatly increased minimum effective scale of organization. The growth of state-wide boards of higher education are symptomatic of these pressures and the fact that resources are always limited. There is often little the individual university can do to stem this tide that is eroding their institutional freedom, but collectively, they still have the power to decide the direction and form of the national system of higher education.

Sir Eric Ashby argues that we must consciously create a national system if we are to assure any reasonable degree of the autonomy necessary to the very nature of an individual university [1].

> I doubt whether. . . statutory autonomy will protect. . . against the harsh wind of politics between now and the year 2000. There is no security in . . . fragmented autonomy . . . what we need is . . . an autonomous system which retains freedom for diversity within itself but which constitutes an 'intellectual estate'; inevitably dependent on government for funds, but strong enough to secure by collective bargaining, the conditions necessary to fulfill its function in society.

Ashby points out that such an interdependent system would require "more central control and less peripheral anarchy within individual universities". Ashby is arguing that for any power of decision over its own future the university must have effective access to society's political decision making, and that the universities' behavior in the public decision process must be organized, purposive, and responsible.

There is a closely related matter which pushes the university in the same

direction. Consciously directed university outreach to accomplish social and economic institutional change must be linked into society's decision systems. This often requires greater scale of operation and more centralization of university decision making than many universities currently experience or are willing to accept.

In the present situation the role of leadership is critical. This is true both in the faculty and the administration. The quality of administrative leadership is critical because the university administration inevitably retains executive responsibility and the external pressures for purposive all-university decisions make the administrative role one of increasing intrinsic importance to the survival and effectiveness of the university. The quality of faculty leadership is strategic because the faculty holds the balance of power between the administration and most outside forces and certainly between the administrator and other inside forces such as the students and the administrative and service bureaucracy. University administrative and faculty leadership and, if you will, the bureaucracy of higher education, must show a greater willingness to accept new organizational forms and innovation in the life of their institutions, if the university is to have a major role in the transformation of social and economic institutions. Certainly they must cease to resent all changes suggested from outside the university. They must recognize that historically major changes in the university almost always have come from without [9].

Problems in Function, Behavior, and Expectations of the University System

The idea of the university is under great stress today. It often appears that almost everyone is trying to subvert it, both from within and without. Society seems bent on turning the university into another conventional production unit of the economic and social system. Inside, the idea of the university is

in intellectual and sometimes civil and administrative chaos. A new generation of student and faculty activists are attempting to transform the concept of the academic freedom of the individual to profess any belief or balue into an obligation of the university as an institution to commit itself to a position in social, economic, and moral disputes (i.e., Viet Nam, civil rights, etc.). This is a dangerous self-defeating idea. In its most shrill form it carries the interesting anti-intellectual assertion that anyone who does not agree with the activist does not have the right of free speech. This is hardly an adequate notion of freedom, academic or otherwise, and can destroy what little community is left to academia. I trust that this lack of respect for intellectual integrity and for other's rights will not prevail in the academy.

The mind set of the nonactivist faculty is often not much more constructive. College professors are becoming some of the most ethnocentric and culture-bound examples of the genus bureaucrat. They frequently vacillate in an irresponsible fashion between thoughtless bureaucratic resistence to any change, and equally thoughtless and impulsive acts in faculty senates. Even more mischief is generated by faculty beliefs that are grossly inconsistent with the reality of the university and its environment. Let me give you some examples.

Many faculty consider all administrative activities to have zero productivity both intrinsically and professionally. At the same time they insist on faculty participation in university decision making from the lowest to the highest level. As the recent quantitative study of faculty attitudes by Dykes puts it,

> Asserting that faculty participation is essential, they placed participation at the botton of their professional priority list and depreciated their colleagues who do participate. Reluctant to assume the burden of guiding institutional affairs, they seemed unwilling to accord others the responsibility for doing so. And, while quick to assert their rights to participate, they recognize less quickly the duties participation entails [5].

The author concludes "If they are unwilling to assume the burden of participation, they must recognize that control over academic affairs will shift into the hands of others". Clearly, academics cannot have it both ways, but that is what they wish and apparently believe possible [5].

The same study records a whole series of very naive faculty notions about university governance. These start with the idea that the university can be managed on a model of a New England town meeting. This is coupled with a distrust of the representative techniques of government which are clearly necessary in a large, complex university if the faculty is to have any effective voice. Many academics also seem to suffer the illusion that 19th century colleges and universities were collegial democracies when in reality they were hierarchic and governed in a most autocratic manner. Thus, many "faculty measure their role in decision making today against a romanticized perception of the past" [5].

Many faculty, even whole departments and colleges, pride themselves in an exclusive dedication to pure or nonmission-oriented research. This attitude dominates the priorities, and the status and reward systems of the university. In its most extreme form it ignores the creative interface between thought and action. In its extreme form it mitigates greatly against good teaching, university involvement in applied or mission-oriented research and in many of the activities that would follow from a commitment to the society for lifelong education, or for societal problem solving. Yet, the university must somehow cut out a role in each of these areas that is sufficiently satisfying to society that the university can survive in a form reasonably acceptable to all involved. It clearly cannot survive by rejecting all societal involvement. Despite the fact that they are directly sustained by the political processes, most faculty refuse to recognize the political nature of the university as an institution.[5/] They

---

[5/] The private institution is less constrained but as public funds come to constitute a major source of its funds, the distinction of its relative isolation from the political decision process fades.

refuse to respect it as a fact.

One of the most unproductive notions in faculty attitudes, which is to some extent shared by administrators, is the idea that faculty-administrative relationships are essentially zero sum games in which anything one gains necessarily is a loss to the other. Faculty members and administrators are perceived as adversaries competing for a limited quantity of power or influence. This is a naive notion of the reality in a modern American university where the capacity for executive initiative can lead to substantially greater command over resources for faculty use. While there are examples of malignant behavior and there are some intrinsically competitive relationships, faculty and administrative power depend in a considerable measure upon each other. An adversary approach to the relationship between faculty and administration will inevitably erode the power and influence of both groups as well as their institution.

Another interesting contradiction which the Dykes' study documents is a great discrepancy between the faculty's perception of its role in decision making in the university and the reality of that role. Faculty consistently lamented their lack of involvement in decisions when, in fact, the faculty had been intimately involved. "The administration was often criticized for failing to consult with the faculty when in fact the faculty had been consulted." "Criticisms were often voiced that decisions had not been taken through proper channels when both protocol and university statutes had been followed scrupulously." Such lack of understanding of the procedures of their own community and failures in communication result in widespread suspicion and distrust. The study reported that "many proudly recounted how long it had been since they had attended a meeting of the faculty at any level, and prolonged absence from faculty meetings was for some a mark of distinction. Yet, all of them decried their lack of information and were quick to criticize the administration for its "subterfuge" [5].

I have discussed elsewhere the distinctive systems of norms that dominate university life [3]. Let me summarize these for you for I think they are useful in perceiving how different norms reinforce differing organizational types and functions. There are at least three quite distinct major sets of norms. The first of these are the norms of vocationalism that focus on employment and occupation. The second set of norms are those of the academic, of science, and of scholarship--that is, a dedication to the creation of new knowledge, to the pursuit of truth, and to "the life of the mind". The third set of norms are those of professionalism which focus on the professionalization of occupational practices and which value uppermost standards, behavior, and organization. Each of these normative systems is to be found in practically all parts of the university in varying mixtures. They have contributed some very positive and some very negative burdens to our university life.

The academic norms of science and humanistic scholarship attach ultimate value to knowledge, particularly the search for new knowledge--irrespective of its social relevance. There is little concern for application or extension of knowledge to the problems of society. It is very easy with such norms to pursue science or scholarship purely for its own sake and to retreat into an ivory tower prideful of its lack of relevance to the outside world. The university must have its ivory towers if progress is to be made in pure science and scholarship, but they may not be allowed to <u>monopolize</u> the research landscape.

While professionalism has created local and national communities of interest for disciplines and specialized departments and aided in the establishment of higher minimum standards for many of the applied areas of knowledge, professionalism tends often to reward the organization man rather than the scientist or scholar. "The modern professional is an organization man", for "professions are more and more practiced in organizations" [8]. Professionalism introduces into

the academic environment of the university an intellectual parochialism and often a gross confusion of objectives. It substitutes "professional activities" for scholarly and scientific endeavor and application. It tends to reward virtuosity and the application of the profession's primary tools and discourages pragmatic problem solving. Many faculty, often disastrously, confuse the norms of professionalism with academic norms.

Particularly in many of the professional schools vocational norms are evident as well as professional and academic norms. Vocationalism sets before itself as a norm the improvement of the welfare and social status of an occupation such as the teaching of English or some commercial or industrial employment as a vocation. It seeks to accomplish this through organization or research to solve the practical problems of industry or the commercial area and through training of youth for vocation in that area. The forces of vocation are utterly pragmatic in outlook. Vocationalism generally has accomplished little without the application of science or the humanities to its problems even though vocationalists are usually staunchly anti-intellectual by instinct. The beginnings of the investment in mass education which were to be of such great importance for economic growth found much of their early support in vocationalism. However, it has to be said that the single-minded protagonist of vocationalism was usually led by his overwhelming pragmatism to an anti-intellectual outlook. The peculiarly persistent anti-intellectualism that survives within the academy has its origin in this set of norms. All three of these norms may usually be found in any college of the university. They exist in different mixes as a consequence of the different objectives, organization, and histories of the colleges.

Today, discussions of objectives, organization change, and norms of behavior in the university are badly disordered by unrecognized or unrespected differences

in the mix of these norms to which various individuals and subunits of the university must adhere for individual sanity and organizational success. If faculties are going to respond to the challenge of constructing a university role in the transformation of social and economic institutions, they will have to grow far more conscious of the diversity of norms that underlie behavior within the university. They must be conscious of and learn to respect each of these norms because each has relevance in sustaining one or another of the historical roles of the university.

Overcoming the Constraints

I warned the organizers of this seminar that while I thought I knew what some of the problems were and had lots of questions, I was not sure of very many answers. However, let me try my hand at a few positive suggestions about what we must begin to do, if we are to be successful in mounting university outreach structures for the purpose of affecting social and economic institutional change.

One of the first things that must be looked to is the reward system of the university. The reward system must be related to the objectives of the program and organization, if expectations are to be structured and reinforced at a level adequate for organizational success. The university has great difficulty rewarding the kind of political and organizational skills needed badly in any social engineering role when they exist in a person without major academic standing. One could point endlessly to other problems, as for example inducing disciplinary departments to contribute their capacity to a social action situation when the reward system of the department is limited entirely to basic research and its publication. The complexities of this problem are endless for the specifics of reward systems are related to the environment and the particular organizational

objectives that are postulated.

I suppose it goes without saying that since the university is a bureaucratic structure, it must use every bureaucratic tool at its command to improve efficiency of communication and organizational effectiveness. Many of the administrative changes that are going on now have been described by O'Rourke [11]. The sensitivity to environment and knowledge of the reality of that environment on the part of both administrators and faculty needs greatly to be improved. Internal learning devices must be developed and resources devoted to sustaining them. Probably both administrative leadership as well as elected faculty leadership must devote more energy to communication with students and the service and academic bureaucracies. The forms and occasions for this communication in good part must yet be generated. Certainly one thing that could be done is to provide, if not require, seminars on the nature and processes of the university for all new faculty. I realize that every new Ph.D. springs fully formed and perfect from the womb of some major professor's mind, but somehow or other we have to improve on this. The learning experiences required of a Ph.D. candidate should be reexamined and altered so that the next generation bears a lighter weight of mythologies in their beliefs.

Out of all of this I would hope that the faculty could learn to live with itself in a more civil manner. I really do not believe that arrogance breeds academic excellence. The faculty is simply going to have to learn to live in a pluralistic institutional environment where specialized and multiple roles are characteristic and in which some minimum respect by one role incumbent of another is necessary if the university as an organization is to survive or adapt to new roles.

I think if I were responsible for university outreach in the socioeconomic area that I would spend a great deal of time worrying about the kinds of expecta-

tions that I was creating as I made decisions. The university already faces staggering strains as a result of the "revolution of rising expectations" of what the university can do in society. The university has limited resources and capacity. The university is not a surrogate for society. University clientele, political and business associates, its faculty, its students, and their parents must not be allowed to think that the university exists solely for their purposes. Obviously some reeducation is already necessary. The expectation of an exclusive clientele relationship is a serious threat to any pluralistic organization.

Clearly the university will not accomplish anything in the transformation of social and eocnomic institutions simply by doing research and hoping someone will apply it. Specialized outreach structures must be organized either by the university, by clients, by the private business sector or by government. In many cases, particularly where a new and innovative process is being extended, there can be no substitute for a university outreach organization. In fact, the purpose of the university in societal problem solving probably should be restricted to innovative and experimental programs and purposes. Once a problem-solving system has been perfected and can be operated in some other way, it should be spun off to public agencies or to private organizations. Some forethought should be given to this process or the choice will not be left to the university. The program and processes will be co-opted by other actors in the scene or the university forced to retain them against its own better judgment, if these matters are not, in some degree, thought through in advance.

University outreach must be led by, and in the hands of skilled political operators. It cannot otherwise succeed. Yet, I do not think the university can simply draft this expertise from the outside. We must train our own for they have to bridge the gap between academic organization, purposes, and ideas, and the political processes of the community. They must be trained to a level

of consciousness in these skills that presently does not prevail as a general matter even in extension organization.

The breakdown in human community and the massive evidence of externalities in the public and private decision processes of this society are eloquent testimony to the fact that our ability to create technical change has outrun our capacity for social invention to accommodate that change--without destroying man, his natural environment or his society. The potential capacity for redressing this imbalance between our knowledge of science and technology and our knowledge of man and his social systems is found primarily in the university. However great the obstacles, it is urgent that the university get on with the business of helping to close this gap.

Literature Cited

[1] Ashby, Sir Eric. "The Case for Ivory Towers", paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education in Tomorrow's World, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 26-29, 1967, p. 16.

[2] Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education, New York: Columbia University Press, 1966, pp. 106, 306.

[3] Bonnen, James T. "The Agricultural Economist's Role in the Changing Research and Educational Establishment", Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting of the Western Farm Economics Association. Las Cruces, New Mexico, July 1967, pp. 1-15.

[4] Bonnen, James T. "The University in Public Affairs", The Encyclopedia of Education, New York: MacMillan, (in the process of publication).

[5] Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making: Report of a Study. American Council on Education Monograph. Washington, D. C., 1968, pp. 33, 40, 41.

[6] Ford Foundation. Urban Extension: A Report on Experimental Programs Assisted by the Ford Foundation. New York, 1966, p. 7.

[7] Gilb, Corinne Lathrop. Hidden Hierarchies. New York: Harper and Row, 1966, p. 112.

[8] Hughes, Everett C. "Professions". Daedalus, Vol. 92, No. 4, Fall 1963, p. 665.

[9] Kerr, Clark. The Uses of the University. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963, pp. 87, 97, 105.

[10] Lynn, Kenneth S., ed. "The Professions," Daedalus, Vol. 92, No. 4, Fall 1963.

[11] O'Rourke, Francis E. and Glenn E. Brooks. The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

[12] Perkins, James A. The University in Transition, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966, pp. 55, 85-6.

[13] Piel, Gerard. Science in the Cause of Man. New York: Knopf, 1961, pp. 274-5

[14] University-wide Academic Senate Committee on University Extension. The New Challenge in Lifelong Learning: A conference on the Future Role of the University in Relation to Public Service. Berkeley: University of California, 1965.

[15] Ward, John W. "The Trouble with Higher Education". The Public Interest, Summer 1966, p. 88.

[16] Warner, W. Lloyd, Darab B. Unwalla and John H. Trimm. The Emergent American Society: Large-Scale Organizations. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.